

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims:**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-7, 14, 15, 18-20, 21-27, 34, 35, 38-43, and 46-47 are pending. Claims 8-13, 16-17, 28-33, 36-37 and 44-45 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3, 6, 14-15, 21-23, 26, 34-35, 41-43 and 46 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Claims:

The Examiner objected to several of the claims for containing various informalities. As amended, these claims are believed to no longer include these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request that these objections be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 7, 8, 21, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,522 to Peterson et al. ("Peterson"). Claims 8 and 28 have been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot. However, with respect to claims 1, 7, 21, and 27, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 21 recite features involving the display of price information about objects purchased at a plurality of bases. Figures 13 and 51 of the present application provide examples of such displays. As an illustrative (but non-limiting) scenario, a consumer may purchase the same objects and materials at the different prices according to its different bases (or offices). The prices of these objects and materials may vary in accordance with, for example, the states or countries corresponding to the bases at the time of purchases.

Peterson fails to teach or suggest the display feature of claims 1 and 21. Instead, Peterson merely discloses "displaying, for each owner (vendor or manufacturer) having a part for sale . . . the price of the item." Peterson at column 15, lines 51-57. Therefore, the displaying in Peterson is from the vendor perspective, not the perspective of claims 1 and 21.

Accordingly. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 21 (and their respective dependent claims 7 and 27) be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 16, 18, 20, 34, 36, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,311,437 to Leal et al. ("Leal"). Claim 16 and 36 have been canceled, thereby rendering their rejection moot.

Independent claims 14 and 34 recite features involving the display of material information including amount-of-money information and/or unit price information about materials purchased at a plurality of bases. Leal involves a materials selector tool. However, Leal fails to teach or suggest the display of material information about materials purchased at a plurality of bases. Accordingly, claims 14 and 34 and their corresponding dependent claims 18, 20, 38 and 40 are patentable over Leal.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

In addition to the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner applies additional references to make the following rejections of dependent claims:

1. Claims 2, 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Appl. Publ No. 2003/0078862 to Kojima et al. (Kojima).
2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson and Kojima and further in view of McKendrick.
3. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,115 to Kurabashi et al. ("Kurabashi").
4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,304,854 to Harris. ("Harris").
5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0035463 to Lynch et al. ("Lynch").
6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,484,182 to Dunphy et al. ("Dunphy").

7. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Leal in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,552,995 to Sebastian (“Sebastian”).

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Leal in view of Peterson.

9. Claims 22, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kojima

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kojima, and further in view of McKendrick.

11. Claims 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kuribayshi and further in view of Harris, Lynch and Dunphy.

12. Claims 35, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Leal in view of Sebastian and further in view Peterson.

13. Claims 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kojima. Claims 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Lynch.

14. Claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Leal in view of Sebastian.

Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn because the additional references fail to overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of Peterson and Leal.

In addition, claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of Official Notice taken by the Examiner. Also, claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Leal in view of Official Notice taken by the Examiner. Independent claim 41 recites features similar to those recited in claims 1 and 21. Also, independent claim 46 recites features similar to those recited in claims 14 and 34. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the official notice taken by the Examiner does not

overcome the deficiencies of Peterson and Leal. Accordingly, Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4685.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4685.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 7/26/2004

By: John A. Harroun

John A. Harroun
Registration No. 46,339
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053